

REMARKS

Summary of Office Action

Claims 75-92 were pending in this application.

Claims 87-92 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 75-92 were rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3-6, 12, 14-17, 23, and 25-28 of U.S. Patent No. 6,732,367 (hereinafter "the parent case").

Claims 75-78, 81-84, and 87-90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ellis et al. U.S. Patent No. 7,185,355 (hereinafter "Ellis '355").

Summary of Applicants' Reply

Applicants have amended claims 75, 81, and 87-92 to more particularly define the claimed invention. No new matter has been added, and the amendments to the claims are fully supported by the originally filed application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of this application in light of the amendments to the claims and the remarks that follow.

Applicants' Reply to the § 101 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 87-92, which refer to "machine-readable media," as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner suggested that claims 87-92 be amended to specify "computer-readable media." Applicants have amended claims 87-92 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the § 101 rejection of claims 87-92 be withdrawn.

Applicants' Reply to the Double Patenting Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 75-92 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting in view of claims 1, 3-6, 12, 14-17, 23, and 25-28 in the parent case. In the interest of advancing prosecution, applicants submit herewith a Terminal Disclaimer in view of the parent case. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the double patenting rejection be withdrawn.

Applicants' Reply to the § 102 Rejection

Applicants' invention, as defined by independent claims 75, 81, and 87, is directed to a method, a system, and computer-readable media for using an interactive television program guide (IPG). Program listings are provided to the IPG. At least some of the program listings contain potentially objectionable program listings information. When the program listings are displayed by the IPG, unobjectionable program listings information is displayed in place of the objectionable program listings information.

The Examiner rejected applicants' claims 75-78, 81-84, and 87-90 (prior to amendment) as being anticipated by Ellis '355. In particular, on page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner cites to col. 15, ll. 42-57 and the "restricted" message of Ellis '355 as allegedly showing applicants' claimed replacing potentially objectionable program listings information with unobjectionable program listings information. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's contentions and submit that the

"restricted" message is not the same as applicants' unobjectionable program listings information. However, in the interest of advancing prosecution, applicants have amended independent claims 75, 81, and 87 to further specify that the unobjectionable program listings information for a program includes descriptive information for a channel, package, or content of that program. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, in applicants' specification at p. 3, ll. 19-23; p. 21, l. 1 through p. 22, l. 6; and FIGS. 10 and 11.

Applicants respectfully submit that Ellis '355 does not show or suggest applicants' claimed unobjectionable program listings information, as specified in amended claims 75, 81, and 87. Ellis '355 merely discloses displaying the word "restricted" in a guide when blocking is invoked (col. 15, ll. 42-57). By itself, this word does not provide any descriptive information related to a program, let alone the descriptive information required by applicants' amended claims. In particular, the "restricted" message does not show or suggest applicants' claimed unobjectionable program listings information, where the unobjectionable program listings information for a program includes descriptive information for a channel, a package, or content of that program.

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that Ellis '355 does not teach each and every element of independent claims 75, 81, and 87. Therefore, independent claims 75, 81, and 87, and dependent claims 76-78, 82-84, and 88-90 which depend therefrom, are allowable over Ellis '355. Applicants respectfully request that the § 102 rejection of claims 75-78, 81-84, and 87-90 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Maxine Lee/

Maxine Lee
Registration No. 61,495
Agent for Applicants
Ropes & Gray LLP
Customer No. 75563